PTO/SB/21 (08-00)
002. OMB 0651-0031

E .			Applic	ation Number	09/991,9	00	
TRANSMITTAL FORM  (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)			Filing Date		November 23, 2001		
			First I	Named Inventor	Gokhale		
			Group	Art Unit	2171		
			Exami	ner Name	Te Chen		
Total Number of Pages in	11	Attorney Docket Number		4982/23			
		ENCLO	DSURES	(check all that apply)			
Fee Transmittal Form				ment Papers Application)		After Allowance Communication Group	
Fee Attached		☐ Drawing(s)		Appeal Communication to Board Appeals and Interferences			
Response to Examiner Interview		Declaration for Utility or Design Patent Application			l Communication to Grou I Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)		
After Final		Petition Routing Slip (PTO/SB/69) and Accompanying Petition		Propri	etary Information		
Affidavits/declaration(s)		Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application		☐ Status	Letter		
Extension of Time Request		Power of Attorney			Enclosure(s) identify below):		
		Terminal Disclaimer		- re	eturn receipt postcard		
Express Abandonmen	Express Abandonment Request		Request for Refund				
Information Disclosure	☐ Information Disclosure Statement		CD, Number of CD(s)				
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)		Rema	Customer No 29858		8		
Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application							
	SIGNA	TURE OF A	APPLICA	ANT, ATTORNEY, O	R AGENT		
Firm or Pri Individual name	Pristine Johannessen, Reg. No. 55,302						
Signature	Phone men						
Date De	December 16, 2004						
		CEI	RTIFICA	TE OF MAILING			
I hereby certify that this co	rrespondence is	being depo	sited with	the United States Post	al Service as	first class mail in an enve	
addressed to: Commissio	ner for Patents,	P.O. Box 14	50, Alexa	ndria, VA 22313-1450	on this date:	December 16, 2004	
Typed or printed name Pristine Johan		nessen					
Signature Over		momen			Date	December 16, 2004	

BRMFS1 545917v1			

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

e Application of

Parag GOKHALE et al.

Appln. No.

09/991,900

Examiner:

Te CHEN

Filing Date

November 23, 2001

Art Unit:

2171

Title

METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR SCHEDULING MEDIA EXPORTS

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## **AMENDMENT**

Sir:

This paper is filed further to the Request for Continued Examination filed September 10, 2004, the interview with Examiner held November 16, 2004, and the Office Action dated June 3, 2004.

Statement of the substance of the interview begins on page 2 of this paper.

Amendments to the Claims begin on page 3 of this paper.

Remarks begin on page 7 of this paper.

## STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.133(b), the Applicants submit the following summary of the substance of the interview with Examiner held November 16, 2004.

The Applicants' representatives, Seth Ostrow and Marcus Muller, explained the invention and its differences from the prior art including U.S. Patent No. 5,764,972 to Crouse et al. ("Crouse"). Mr. Ostrow and Mr. Muller explained that "exporting" and "library" are specific terms that are well-known in the art and which differ from "mounting" with respect to magnetic media as used in Crouse and from file libraries generally. The Examiner indicated that she understood "export" to not include removing media from a storage device and further suggested that she understood exporting and importing media to be similar to uploading and downloading files from the Internet or other network. Mr. Muller respectfully disagreed citing support to the contrary in claim 1 indicating that media is exported "from the library" and further reiterating that "exporting" is well-known and understood in the art to include removing media from a storage device.

The Examiner requested clarification regarding how a "library" according to the invention differs from an electronic library, clarification regarding how a "second time" relates to a "first time" in claim 1, and also clarification of the term "media" as used in claim 1. The Examiner also requested additional information distinguishing "export" from "mount" since she stated that she believed these were synonymous. The Examiner also indicated that she would perform an additional search for proper art more relevant to the claimed invention.